

Office of the  
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

## **FY 2003 Budget Recommendations**

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for  
Capital Facilities and Administrative Services

### **Capital Budget**

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 2.0 Issues
- 3.0 Programs
- 4.0 Additional Information



## 1.0 Summary: Capital Budget

The Capital Budget funds new construction, major remodeling, roofing and paving projects. Capital Development projects are projects that add new square footage or cost more than \$1,500,000. Capital Improvements (also called alterations, repair and improvement or AR&I) are remodeling projects that cost less than \$1,500,000 and do not add new square footage.

The ongoing portion of the Capital Budget base is made up of General Fund and Income Tax – but the State can take advantage of bonds, donations and federal funds to pay for projects. The base budget for FY 2003 is approximately \$89.4 million in tax funds.

	<b>Analyst FY 2003 Base</b>	<b>Analyst FY 2003 Changes</b>	<b>Analyst FY 2003 Total</b>
<b>Financing</b>			
General Fund	65,099,400		65,099,400
Income Tax	24,298,000		24,298,000
Transportation Fund, One-time	1,399,000	(1,399,000)	
Federal Funds		8,500,300	8,500,300
Dedicated Credits Revenue	41,000,000	(18,500,000)	22,500,000
Dedicated Credits - GO Bonds		156,190,500	156,190,500
Dedicated Credits - Revenue Bonds	10,735,800	(10,735,800)	
GFR - Special Administrative Expense	1,186,700	(1,186,700)	
GFR - State Court Complex	700,000	(700,000)	
Olympic Special Revenue	28,500,000	(28,500,000)	
Transfers	387,000	(387,000)	
Transfers - Project Reserve Fund		800,000	800,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$173,305,900</b>	<b>\$104,082,300</b>	<b>\$277,388,200</b>
<b>Programs</b>			
Capital Improvements	43,994,000	6,092,000	50,086,000
Capital Planning	40,000	18,030,000	18,070,000
Capital Development	129,271,900	79,960,300	209,232,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$173,305,900</b>	<b>\$104,082,300</b>	<b>\$277,388,200</b>

## 2.0 Issues

### 2.1 Recommended State Projects

The projects listed in the table below comprise the Analyst's recommendation for approval in the 2002 General Session. With \$40 million available for capital developments, the Analyst recommendation would require an additional \$153 million. For ease of discussion, projects requiring appropriations beyond the base are listed under the "Bonding" category, but the Legislature may choose other sources to pay for approved projects. The list below reflects an aggregate recommendation and is not listed in any priority order.

Project	State Funds	Federal Funds	Trans. Fund	Inst. Funds	Bonding	Total Project
Capital Improvements	\$49,386,000			\$700,000		\$50,086,000
Weber State University Classroom Building---Davis Campus					\$20,500,000	20,500,000
Dixie State College Eccles/Graff Performing Arts Ctr.	13,308,000			\$3,500,000		16,808,000
Snow College Performing Arts Center				2,000,000	15,583,000	17,583,000
Brigham City Education Center Purchase	2,741,000					2,741,000
U of U Health Sciences Building					37,500,000	37,500,000
USU Merrill Library					40,200,000	40,200,000
U of U Marriott Library				17,000,000	37,253,500	54,253,500
Capitol Preservation Board Capitol Restoration Design	17,970,000					17,970,000
Youth Corrections - St. George	1,792,700	\$5,424,300			1,792,700	9,009,700
Youth Corrections - Canyonlands	3,125,000	2,476,000			3,125,000	8,726,000
DABC - Tooele Package Store Replacement					1,836,300	1,836,300
Utah National Guard - Deferred Maintenance Projects	1,074,700				(1,600,000)	(525,300)
DFCM Regional Center Planning				\$100,000		\$100,000
	<b>\$89,397,400</b>	<b>\$7,900,300</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$23,300,000</b>	<b>\$156,190,500</b>	<b>\$276,788,200</b>

### 2.2 Capital Improvements

Capital Improvements - also called alterations, repairs and improvements – must be funded before any new capital development project can be approved. Last year the Legislature increased the minimum funding formula from 0.9 percent to 1.1 percent of the value of all state buildings. The new formula brings the statutory minimum to \$49,386,000 which can be combined with an additional \$700,000 from the Project Reserve Fund for a total **recommended appropriation of \$50,086,000 to fund Capital Improvements**. This will provide an increase of nearly \$10 million over FY 2002 requirements and, if approved, will represent the most money ever appropriated for capital improvements. The Analyst recommendation follows intent language approved last year to assume that the statutory increase in funding would come from existing budgets. The Analyst assumes that the Legislature will again fund increases in this program as a mandate in FY 2004.

## 2.3 Pay As You Go

The Legislature is in the third year of a six-year plan to convert all facility financing to a cash basis. The foundation of the plan is the current practice of using short-term borrowing to fund capital facilities. In the past the state issued bonds that matured in six years, paying five interest payments and retiring the principal in the sixth year. The Analyst is concerned that short term borrowing may not constitute the highest and best use of funds. If the Legislature remains committed to transferring debt service savings to the Capital Budget, it seems that the pay as you go plan offers a tremendous advantage in long term planning for capital developments.

As the pay as you go plan advances, FY 2003 and 2004 comprise the most difficult years to maintain momentum as there is not a great deal of savings to transfer from the Debt Service program. With large transfers from debt service savings in FY 2005 and 2006 the Capital Budget will grow to more than \$150 million per year.

*Pay as you go  
means phasing  
projects*

Recent Legislative policy refrained from phased funding of capital developments. To fully implement the “pay as you go” plan, it will be necessary to provide phased funding over the construction life of large projects, most notably the State Capitol. The Analyst supports the policy of funding design and construction together but suggests that the Legislature should consider the policy to be a guideline rather than a rigid rule when evaluating funding options. The policy should analyze projects that have distinct components and fund those components so that an unexpected shortfall will not leave the state with an obligation to fund projects that are incomplete.

## 2.4 Bond Initiative – Modifying Pay As You Go

Once Capital Improvements are funded the Capital Budget contains \$40 million that is free to use on development projects. A major component of the “pay as you go” plan included the use of one-time funds that were anticipated for FY 2001. Recent economic conditions left the Capital Budget \$52 million short of expectations – four buildings were not funded as a result of the shortfall. Clearly, this totals more money than is available in the FY 2003 budget for Capital Projects. The Analyst believes that it is appropriate for buildings approved but not funded to be the Legislature’s top facility priorities for the 2002 General Session. In two cases the buildings are already designed, a third is a part of a package that will provide \$5 million in savings and the fourth includes a commitment to Box Elder County.

The pay as you go plan will be difficult to implement if “unfunded” projects are moved to the top of the FY 2003 list and no other projects are included. This year there are several critical projects that warrant serious consideration for funding even though debt must be issued to complete them. Given revenue shortfalls anticipated in FY 2003, the Analyst believes that a one-time Bond Initiative may provide a reasonable solution to funding critical facility needs.

*Modified plan  
includes controls*

If the Legislature chooses bonding as a funding source for FY 2003, the Analyst proposes a one-time bond initiative that will take care of critical needs in Higher Education and State Government. The one-time bond recommendation assumes the same logic as the pay as you go plan – if debt service savings are transferred into the capital budget as facility debt is retired, funding for new debt should flow out of the capital budget. If additional projects are funded with General Obligation Bonds of \$156 million, the Analyst assumes that the fiscal impact will be appropriated from existing capital budgets. This will require no appropriation of new money and will restrict the amount of projects available for inclusion in a large bond. It will also require a longer term for GO debt, probably at a term of fifteen years. Next year the Capital Facilities Committee can return to pay as you go with a substantial base budget and a project list that is more manageable.

*Recommendation  
focuses on repairing  
existing facilities*

In building a list of recommended projects, the Analyst focused on facilities approved last year but left unfunded and replacements of existing facilities that have outlived their utility and present a danger to occupants. New facilities are not recommended, as they require additional future appropriations for staff and operations. The Analyst believes that next year's revenue picture will provide greater clarity to consider facilities that expand campuses or operations at state agencies.

The Analyst believes that achieving the greatest impact in approving these projects involves a quick implementation process. Therefore, the recommendation encourages the use of bonds and federal funds for projects that are ready to begin construction. Not only will this keep the unfunded projects at the top of the list, it may accelerate the pace at which facilities can be built, providing an immediate impact to an ailing construction industry.

*Will Bonding  
Stimulate the  
Economy?*

During the interim a great deal of discussion focused on the economic benefit of bonding for capital projects. To be clear, bonding does not provide economic stimulus, construction does. Bonding is a means of accelerating construction for projects that cost more than is available in cash or that are deemed to have a lifespan sufficient that policy makers want to spread the cost across as many users as possible. In short, bonding is a financial tool that allows governments to fund significant construction projects. Construction creates jobs and provides indirect and induced stimulus in other sectors of the economy.

The Analyst recommendation includes general obligation bonding as a funding source so that the state can pay for projects that were held back and that are needed in the new year. Part of the recommendation includes consideration of the trend for construction to lag behind the economy as a whole – if the economy as a whole begins to recover, the construction industry will lag behind the recovery by one or two years. From an economic stimulus perspective, this recommendation seeks to shorten the lag in the construction industry, thus providing an overall boost to the economy.

## 2.5 Alternatives to Capital Construction

Every year the Legislature tries to solve the dilemma of determining if programs drive facilities or if facilities drive programs. Over the course of the 2001 Interim the Analyst has become increasingly concerned that agencies and institutions are not doing all they can to ensure that capital costs are minimized. Agencies request new buildings without addressing opportunities to change business practices through creative use of technology. Some colleges and universities seek to expand campuses without addressing opportunities to consolidate programs. Even worse, some schools continue to add new programs and degrees seemingly with little consideration for impacts on space allocations. In many cases this comes from disincentives to eliminate inexpensive programs that subsidize important but costly missions.

Utah is a small state that must manage its resources carefully. The Analyst believes that the Legislature should work with agencies and institutions to find solutions that do not require expensive new facilities and added programs. In some cases programs could be eliminated or consolidated in a way that rewards the agency and encourages creative thinking. In the short term, it may seem like the state is paying a premium for some programs, but in the long term the state will be able to count on a capital budget that is manageable, efficient and dedicated to funding only the highest priorities.

## 2.6 DFCM Project Cost Estimates

In the past a significant part of the Analyst budget considered DFCM *Capital Budget Estimates* (CBE). The Analyst continues to analyze each CBE and believes that the agency is becoming better at estimating costs. This emphasis on good estimates combined with better oversight allowed DFCM to realize unprecedented savings through better definition and significant reduction of change orders. This issue is discussed more fully in the DFCM budget recommendation as a performance issue.

A negative aspect to providing competing cost estimates is the inevitable debate about the “true” cost of a facility. The Analyst believes that this debate pulled too much focus away from overall priorities and proved to be an inefficient use of committee energy. Therefore, this year the Analyst worked with DFCM to find agreement on cost estimates and uses those to make recommendations. Individual CBEs are still available to members at their request. The Analyst will continue to monitor DFCM’s ability to return appropriated funds to the Legislature as part of the annual performance measure report found in the agency operating budget recommendation.

### 3.0 Programs: Capital Budget

#### 3.1 Capital Improvements

The Analyst is recommending Capital Improvement funding of \$49,386,000. If the Legislature approves this statutory minimum it will represent the largest single Capital Improvement appropriation ever.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	21,753,000	26,994,000	32,386,000	5,392,000
General Fund, One-time	15,000,000	(4,400,000)		
Income Tax		17,000,000	17,000,000	
Transfers - Project Reserve Fund			700,000	700,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$36,753,000</b>	<b>\$39,594,000</b>	<b>\$50,086,000</b>	<b>\$6,092,000</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Other Charges/Pass Thru	36,753,000	39,594,000	50,086,000	6,092,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$36,753,000</b>	<b>\$39,594,000</b>	<b>\$50,086,000</b>	<b>\$6,092,000</b>

Capital Improvements are major alteration, repair and improvements (AR&I) of the State's fixed capital assets. Capital improvement funds may not be used for program equipment or routine maintenance.

Minimum funding levels for Capital Improvements are set in statute:

*The Legislature may not fund the design or construction of any new capital development projects, except to complete the funding of projects for which partial funding has been previously provided, until the Legislature has appropriated 1.1 percent of the replacement cost of existing State facilities to capital improvements (UCA 63A-5-104(5))*

#### *Maintenance Backlog*

As reported by the Analyst during the 1999 interim, the State's maintenance backlog approaches \$400 million. Capital Improvement funds help to reduce the backlog but cannot address all issues. Many facilities have significant problems that require more than the \$1,500,000 statutory cap allowed for capital improvements (examples include the Marriott and Merrill Libraries, the Eccles-Graff Fine Arts Building and the State Capitol). In these cases, funds must be used from the Capital Development portion of this budget. The Building Board and DFCM should be commended for their focus on Capital Improvements. However, it is important to note that Capital Improvements alone cannot alleviate the maintenance backlog. The Capital Facilities and Administrative Services Committee should continue to focus on large projects that need Capital Development funds to correct massive problems that inflate maintenance backlog totals.



*FY 2002 AR&I  
Funding*

Capital improvement funding continues to increase, reaching \$43.9 million in Fiscal Year 2002. Even though the Utah System of Higher Education manages nearly two-thirds of all state owned space, the USHE receives, on average, about forty-four percent of improvement funds. This can be partially attributed to newer campuses (SLCC, UVSC, SUU and Dixie) but the Analyst believes a large part of the credit should go to excellent management by USHE officials. Each school carefully tracks O&M expenditures and uses campus resources to ensure that routine maintenance is performed. In recent years Presidents at Utah State University and the College of Eastern Utah moved major infrastructure improvements to the top of their priority lists. At the University of Utah, officials found a way to pay for significant plant upgrades through an energy saving program. The Analyst believes this commitment to restoring infrastructure is commendable and has saved the state millions of dollars.

Capital Improvement Expenditures						
	Higher Education	UCAT/Public Education	General Government	Law Enforcement	Statewide Issues	Total
<b>FY 2002*</b>	23,839,909	1,915,800	8,667,458	3,848,761	4,140,000	42,411,928
<i>FY 02 %</i>	56%	5%	20%	9%	10%	
<b>FY 2001</b>	17,462,500	1,270,500	10,760,500	2,708,700	4,550,800	36,753,000
<i>FY 01 %</i>	48%	3%	29%	7%	12%	
<b>FY 2000</b>	15,842,300	1,687,800	8,429,400	2,983,800	4,614,700	33,558,000
<i>FY 00 %</i>	47%	5%	25%	9%	14%	
<b>FY 1999</b>	17,231,543	2,638,435	8,565,535	3,037,937	1,000,000	32,473,450
<i>FY 99 %</i>	53%	8%	26%	9%	3%	
<b>FY 1998</b>	13,235,366	2,938,200	10,346,675	1,681,900	3,850,957	32,053,098
<i>FY 98 %</i>	41%	9%	32%	5%	12%	
<b>FY 1997</b>	12,667,800	1,969,200	12,171,500	2,333,100		29,141,600
<i>FY 97 %</i>	43%	7%	42%	8%		
<b>FY 1996</b>	9,059,350	1,069,900	6,431,550	1,963,800		18,524,600
<i>FY 96 %</i>	49%	6%	35%	11%		
<b>FY 1995</b>	5,605,100	555,000	7,678,100	1,465,000		15,303,200
<i>FY 95 %</i>	37%	4%	50%	10%		
<b>FY 1994</b>	4,536,600	635,700	7,270,200	1,894,400		14,336,900
<i>FY 94 %</i>	32%	4%	51%	13%		
<b>Total Expenditur</b>	<b>Higher Education</b>	<b>Public Education</b>	<b>General Government</b>	<b>Law Enforcement</b>	<b>Statewide Issues</b>	<b>Increase FY 94-01</b>
<b>FY 94-01</b>	119,480,468	14,680,535	80,320,918	21,917,398	18,156,457	254,555,776
<b>Average %</b>						
<b>FY 94-01</b>	47%	6%	32%	9%	7%	100%
1994-1997: Law enforcement category includes Courts, Corrections and Public Safety.						
1998-2001: Law enforcement category includes above plus Youth Corrections.						
* FY 2002 Funding includes \$2.8 million in transfers						

*Statewide AR&I  
Issues*

In FY 2002 the Building Board allocated more than \$4.1 million in capital improvement funds for “Statewide funding issues.” Statewide funding issues are listed in the table below.

<b>Project</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>
Facility Audits	\$215,000	\$215,000	\$220,000
Condition Assessments	700,000	950,000	1,000,000
Energy Program	815,700	800,000	150,000
Scanning of Documents	80,000	125,300	-
Topographical Surveying	50,000	42,000	-
DFCM CAD Standards	150,000	132,000	170,000
Hazardous Materials	850,000	801,500	700,000
Emergency Power Source (Generators)	354,000		-
Paving PM	250,000	350,000	350,000
Paving UCI	150,000	235,000	250,000
Roofing PM	200,000	500,000	400,000
Roofing UCI	300,000	300,000	300,000
Roofing - Seismic		300,000	300,000
Emergency Roofing	200,000	300,000	-
Emergency Funds	300,000	200,000	200,000
Land Option		100,000	100,000
<b>Total - Statewide Issues</b>	<b>\$4,614,700</b>	<b>\$5,350,800</b>	<b>\$ 4,140,000</b>

One of the larger items addressed in the statewide issues category is the condition assessment program. DFCM contracts for engineering studies to provide key data on the condition of state owned facilities. The Legislative Auditor determined that more than eighty percent of assessments prioritized in the capital improvement process. The Analyst believes that this program is paying long term dividends and will continue to monitor and report on its progress.

### 3.2 Capital Planning

The Analyst is recommending use of the project reserve fund to investigate the need for regional centers in Washington and Weber Counties.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	2,050,000	40,000	17,970,000	17,930,000
Transfers - Project Reserve Fund			100,000	100,000
Beginning Nonlapsing	36,500			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,086,500</b>	<b>\$40,000</b>	<b>\$18,070,000</b>	<b>\$18,030,000</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Other Charges/Pass Thru	2,086,500	40,000	18,070,000	18,030,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,086,500</b>	<b>\$40,000</b>	<b>\$18,070,000</b>	<b>\$18,030,000</b>

#### 3.2.1 Capitol Restoration

Last year the Legislature approved the construction of two office buildings to serve as surge space for the Capitol during the main phase of reconstruction. This option proved to be the most cost-effective solution to facilitating the base isolation and structural retrofit of the Capitol Building. The Capitol Preservation Board will begin the construction of the new surge space in April.



The Capitol Extension is a completion of Richard Kletting's original plan for Capitol Hill. When the original facility was built, the architect envisioned additional space to the north of the capitol, adjacent to the east and west ends of the building. In researching design guidelines, the Capitol Preservation Board developed a modest extension proposal that will visually complement the main building without adding unnecessary costs.

During the eighteen month construction period, the Board plans to move forward with engineering and architectural design for the Capitol Building. **The Analyst recommends funding \$17,970,000 for all preliminary design work.** Upon completion of the extensions, those occupying the Capitol will move into quarters in the new buildings, allowing for work to begin on the main building immediately.

### 3.2.2 Planning for Regional Centers

DFCM presented information to the Building Board detailing the need for central locations of services in Washington and Weber Counties. The state has a number of leases in each county, many of which will expire soon. With growth in both counties, it makes sense to consider co-locating many state services.



The Analyst Recommendation includes an appropriation of \$100,000 from the Project Reserve Fund to study options in relation to regional centers and to provide funds for purchase options to secure property for future facilities.

To accomplish the study, the Analyst recommends the following intent language:

*It is the intent of the Legislature that DFCM shall examine the need for central state facilities in Washington and Weber Counties. It is assumed that this study will be complete prior to October 1, 2002 and that it will provide an analysis of lease rates that may be used to fund new construction.*

### 3.2.3 Planning for Archives

Last year the Legislature approved funds to provide planning for the Archives. At the time of printing, that study was not complete. The Analyst finds this to be somewhat disconcerting given that the Capitol Preservation Board is on a short time schedule and needs to demolish the space currently occupied by the administrative arm of the Archives. Over the past year, the Analyst considered the following options, in order of capital cost to the state:

1. Move Archives administration to space in the Rio Grande Depot that is currently occupied by the Utah Arts Council. Although it would be a tight fit, the space is currently underutilized and would provide the Archives with the downtown location it desires without the expense of buying additional real estate. Moving costs for the Arts Council would be minimal as they could share space with State History in the main part of the Depot or move back into their administrative space on South Temple.

2. Move Archives to the space currently occupied by the State Library on 19<sup>th</sup> West and North Temple, behind the Tax Commission. The State Library funnels federal grants to county libraries, stocks county book mobiles and provides inter-library loan services. This is a function that could be combined with the Utah Academic Library Consortium, a cooperative effort between the nine state colleges, Westminster University and Brigham Young University. For space, the State Library could relocate to the Fine Arts Building adjacent to the Marriott Library on the University of Utah campus until the Marriott remodel is completed. This would not impede the State Library's mission and there may be operational savings achieved through combined efficiencies. There would be costs incurred to move the Library and renovate the Fine Arts building, but those costs could be covered through Capital Improvements. **This would not impact space occupied by State Services for the Blind.**
3. Build an administrative building downtown near the Rio Grande Depot – planned site of the Utah Cultural Center. This would locate the Archives near a public private partnership that includes state arts and state history. The Division of Archives would still need to rent space for storage of records which increases long term costs. DFCM anticipates that this would cost between \$4 million and \$7 million, depending on the type of facility.
4. Build a new facility for Archives behind the State Library. Warehouse space could be shared between the two divisions. This would create efficiencies between the Library and Archives. The State already owns the land at that location and could begin work on the new facility quickly. DFCM estimates that a new building at that location would cost approximately \$9 million.

The Analyst believes that Option 2 offers great promise and recommends the following intent language for DFCM:

*It is the intent of the Legislature that the Legislative Fiscal Analyst shall complete a thorough Analysis of options relating to locating the State Archives in the facility currently occupied by the State Library. It is assumed that this report will be provided no later than July 1, 2002 and will be presented to an interim meeting of either the Executive Appropriations Committee or at a meeting of the Capital Facilities and Administrative Services Committee, or both.*

### 3.3 State Funded Capital Development

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	11,702,300	38,065,400	14,743,400	(23,322,000)
General Fund, One-time	(1,600,000)	(2,088,000)		(1,000)
Uniform School Fund	11,816,100			
Income Tax		7,298,000	7,298,000	
Income Tax, One-time	82,546,000	(8,628,500)		(10,000,000)
Transportation Fund	611,000			
Transportation Fund, One-time		1,399,000		(1,399,000)
Federal Funds	1,170,000		8,500,300	8,500,300
Dedicated Credits Revenue	428,000	41,000,000	22,500,000	(18,500,000)
Dedicated Credits - GO Bonds	8,600,000	18,628,500	156,190,500	156,190,500
Dedicated Credits - Revenue Bonds		10,735,800		(10,735,800)
GFR - Special Administrative Expense		1,186,700		(1,186,700)
GFR - State Court Complex		700,000		(700,000)
Olympic Special Revenue		28,500,000		(28,500,000)
Transfers		387,000		(387,000)
Transfers - Youth Corrections	2,319,200			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$117,592,600</b>	<b>\$137,183,900</b>	<b>\$209,232,200</b>	<b>\$69,959,300</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Other Charges/Pass Thru	117,592,600	137,183,900	209,232,200	69,959,300
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$117,592,600</b>	<b>\$137,183,900</b>	<b>\$209,232,200</b>	<b>\$69,959,300</b>

#### 3.3.1 Snow College Performing Arts

Snow College offers one of just a few certified performing arts programs at the junior college level. This is in spite of aging facilities in converted physical education buildings and an old church. Last year the Legislature approved funding for a new building that will bring all performing arts students and faculty under the same roof, but the project was held back due to funding constraints.



DFCM was able to use \$986,800 for design and the college recently announced a \$2 million donation to the project. **The Analyst recommends restoration of \$15,583,000 in state funds to complete the project.**

### 3.3.2 Dixie State College Fine Arts

The Fine Arts Program at Dixie State College is housed in an aging facility that is unsafe for students and is outdated for current programs. Three years ago DFCM forced the closure of the basement and provided remodeling funds to temporarily house part of the program in a converted grocery store.



The conversion provided an excellent interim fix, but cannot provide a long-term solution due to ADA problems. Programming is complete at a cost of \$1.3 million, Dixie State College has \$3.5 million in hand for the project and **the Analyst recommends state funding for the remaining \$13,308,000 this year.**

### 3.3.3 Weber State University Davis Campus

Five years ago the Legislature purchased 106 acres for a new higher education campus in Layton, just south of Hill Air Force Base. Weber State provides many night classes in local high schools but lacks sufficient space in its current Davis facility to offer a full array of classes during the day. Given that thirty-five percent of all WSU students live in Davis County, USHE officials are confident that an expanded daytime program will be successful on the Layton Campus.



During the 2000 General Session the Legislature appropriated funds to Weber State to provide programming money for the facility. In 2001 the building was approved by the Legislature, but revenue shortfalls required the state to postpone construction. The building was bid as part of a four building package – if funding is not restored costs could increase by as much as twenty percent.

**The Analyst recommends restored funding for the Weber State University Davis County building at a cost of \$20,500,000.**

### 3.3.4 Bridgerland ATC Purchase

The Legislature approved the purchase of a converted retail complex that the Bridgerland College of Applied Technology currently leases from Box Elder County. Utah State University is also a tenant of the building. The purchase includes eleven acres of land that could be used for expansion as the schools grow. The purchase provides needed growth space in Brigham City and will allow the Bridgerland UCAT and USU to transfer lease payments to program offerings. **The Analyst recommends the restoration of \$2,741,000 to purchase the facility.**

### 3.3.5 University of Utah Health Sciences Classroom Building

The School of Medicine and the Colleges of Nursing, Pharmacy and Health are housed within the University of Utah Health Sciences Center. Currently, nearly all of the Health Science education services are provided in buildings completed in the late 1960's. The capacity, configuration and aging of existing facilities is hampering the delivery of educational programs and limit growth potential. Perhaps most importantly, the School of Medicine building (Building 521) fails to meet health and safety standards. The Health Sciences Education Building will address space and safety issues as well as create an interdisciplinary environment for health professional education which will enhance both quality and efficiency.

As the Health Sciences campus ages, the University works to replace as much infrastructure as possible with non-state funds. Donations and revenue bonds will be used to build the Emma Eccles Jones Medical Science building, the Pharmaceutical Education and Research building, the Huntsman Cancer Research Hospital, the expansion of the University Hospital, and an expansion of the Moran Eye Center. A key to meeting legislative expectations for quality and future programmatic growth at the University of Utah includes construction of a new classroom building on the upper campus to serve all of the Health Science Schools.

As part of the ongoing restoration plan for the University's upper campus, **the Analyst recommends approval of \$37,500,000 in state funds to construct a new Health Sciences Education Classroom Building at the University of Utah.**



### 3.3.6 Utah State University Merrill Library Replacement Seismic Restoration

The central library at Utah State University was built in three phases, with each of the last two phases essentially adding a building to the existing structure. The result is a facility that contains significant egress problems that would make exiting in an emergency extremely difficult. In addition to life safety problems, the building is aging and can not be readily retro-fitted for new technology, movable stacks or group learning areas.

The current facility dates to the 1930s and restoration or remodeling would cost more than erection of a new facility. Officials at the University designated a site adjacent to the Science and Technology Library for construction of a new facility. The new facility will integrate new technology and provide three times more storage space than the current facility while occupying a similarly sized footprint.



The Analyst does not see an opportunity to combine this project with the U of U Marriott library. Although both projects will result in new library space, the projects are substantially different in scope. While the construction solution for each project is unique, the Analyst does believe that savings could arise from joint purchases of library equipment. Each facility will likely make use of common elements such as furniture, rolling stacks, data ready study carrels and information technology systems. Therefore, the Analyst encourages DFCM to work with each school to jointly purchase equipment and furnishings when such purchases will provide further savings to the state.

**The Analyst recommends state funding of \$40,200,000 to complete the Merrill Library at Utah State University.**

### 3.3.7 University of Utah Marriott Library

Following the 2001 General Session, the University of Utah anticipated placing a Marriott Library remodel at number two on their priority list for FY 2003 consideration. Following an engineering study funded by the University, officials determined that the life safety problems within the library warranted placement at the top of the institutional priority list. The remodeling project as anticipated by the University was found to be unworkable due to severe seismic needs within the existing structure. Instead of filing a \$12 million request with a \$6 million matching donation, the cost of the project jumped to \$40 million and the institution promised to fund \$17 million from gifts.

The Building Board recommended a \$3 million study to find a way to combine this project with replacement of the library at Utah State University. DFCM now believes the study could be completed for \$500,000, but the Analyst is not convinced that this would be the best use of limited resources. In the past the Legislature directed schools within the higher education system to fund planning – and in some cases, design – from institutional funds. The University of Utah committed more than \$200,000 and countless staff time to finding a solution for their library problem. To fund yet another study only delays the problem.

The University has shown that moving the library is not feasible and that a seismic retrofit is the best solution. The Building Board hoped to find a common solution for the Marriott Library and the Merrill Library at USU. Unlike the Marriott project, the best solution for USU is a new facility on a new site. It seems unlikely that savings could be found by attempting to force a common solution on these disparate projects. The Analyst supports the use of standardized design, but notes that it is not always the best solution to facility needs.



To seismically upgrade the Marriott Library at the University of Utah, **the Analyst recommends state funding in the amount of \$37,253,500 to be matched against \$17,000,000 in institutional funds raised through donations.**

### 3.3.8 DABC Package Store – Tooele

The Utah Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control funds all operations through sales of liquor, wine and heavy beer. Profits from sales fund programs such as free and reduced lunch and returns more than \$30 million a year to the General Fund for appropriation. As a true enterprise fund, DABC must fund growth within its revenue. This year DABC is requesting approval of a new store in Tooele County at a cost of \$1,836,300. Growth rates in Tooele County are double that of state rates and the aging store is located away from population centers. Under normal circumstances the Department would issue revenue bonds to fund construction and pay debt service from store profits. By issuing general obligation debt, the state pays a lower interest rate and the profits that would have gone to debt service are instead transferred to the General Fund for appropriation.

With the above understanding, **the Analyst recommends including \$1,836,300 as part of a General Obligation bond to replace the existing Tooele County package store.**

### 3.3.9 Youth Corrections Projects

Over the past eight years the Legislature demonstrated a strong commitment to providing young offenders with facilities that maximize the potential for rehabilitation while protecting public safety. To ensure that Utah maintains the most effective youth detention program possible, the Legislature regularly provided funds for new and expanded youth detention centers. Youth Correction facilities are generally small – 32 or 48 beds – and cost six to seven million dollars. Federal funds from the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing (VOI/TIS) program provide a significant offset to costs for new facilities. The VOI/TIS program no longer offers federal money to states, but reserve funds are sufficient to fund two-thirds of the cost of new facilities needed by the Division of Youth Corrections.



*Facility Design  
should be cost  
effective*

The Analyst recommendation includes state and federal funds for replacement facilities in Washington County and at the Canyonlands facility in Blanding. Due to the nature of each facility, the Blanding facility requires more state funds than Washington County. **The Analyst recommends an authorization of \$1,792,700 in state funds to be matched against \$5,424,300 in Federal Funds to build a 48 bed secure facility in Washington County and an authorization of \$3,125,000 in state funds to be matched against \$2,476,000 in Federal Funds to build a 32 bed facility in Blanding.**

Members of the Capital Facilities and Administrative Services Subcommittee expressed concern that youth correctional facilities may be overbuilt when gyms with hardwood floors are added to the design. While the Analyst understands the programmatic need for indoor exercise space, it is clear that programming does not require hardwood floors with thirty foot ceilings. This design adds construction costs and is expensive to heat and cool. According to DFCM, the cost savings from not constructing the high ceiling gym could fund an additional eight beds within a facility. To encourage savings on this project and future facilities the Analyst recommends the following intent language be applied to the construction of all Youth Detention Centers:

*It is the intent of the Legislature that Youth Corrections provide programmatic exercise space at the lowest cost possible both for construction and ongoing operations when constructing new facilities.*

### **3.3.10 Transportation Projects**

Given current revenue estimates and significant needs for highway construction and maintenance, the Department of Transportation is not requesting funds for facility repair or construction in FY 2003.

### **3.3.11 Utah National Guard Projects**

The state maintains \$1.6 million in bonding authority that is designated for use to match federal funds in building a new armory in American Fork. The National Guard no longer anticipates receipt of federal funds for this project and seeks authorization of a transfer to fund other maintenance issues. Rather than issue debt to fund armory improvements, the Analyst believes that capital improvement funds could be used in place of the bonding authority. This would free up \$1.6 million in the recommended bond to apply to other state needs. Over the past four years, the Guard received an average of \$650,000 per year in AR&I funds. Assuming a similar level in FY 2003, **the Analyst recommends an additional \$1,074,700 in state funds to address the maintenance backlog at UNG facilities.** To ensure the most immediate needs are met, the Analyst recommends the following intent language:

*It is the intent of the Legislature the National Guard shall work with DFCM and the State Building Board to ensure the most critical maintenance backlog needs are funded with FY 2003 capital appropriations.*

### 3.4 Non-State Funded Projects

The table below shows projects recommended for funding from sources other than State funds. The Analyst is concerned that current facilities carry maintenance backlogs as the State continues to accept donated buildings or approve fee-driven projects. The Analyst also recognizes that many donated or fee-driven projects provide extraordinary value to the State. For example, the Board of Pardons seeks approval of a federally funded remodel at the Oquirrh prison facility. The remodel will use VOI/TIS funds to provide a new hearing room and twenty-four secure beds. The new hearing room will allow the Board of Pardons to hold hearings without taking prisoners beyond the perimeter fence and will reduce travel and transport to and from Gunnison.

Recommended Non-State Funded Projects			
Project	Amount	Source of Funds	O/M
SLCC Grand Theater Renovate/Addition	\$12,000,000	Donations	\$240,000
U of U Department of Chemistry Gauss House	1,500,000	Grant	\$67,700
U of U Eccles Health Science Library	7,500,000	Donations	\$34,700
U of U Moran Eye Ctr. II Addition	16,900,000	Donations	
U of U Children's Dance Theatre	6,100,000	Donations	
USU Research Foundation Facility	19,000,000	Revenue Bond	
USU Teaching Pavilion Animal Science Farm	500,000	Donations	\$30,300
SUU Student Housing Complex	11,000,000	Donation/ Fees	
Snow South - Multi Purpose Center	2,500,000	Revenue Bond	\$566,300
UNG Salt Lake/Davis Co. Land Acquisition	1,300,000	Federal Funds	
UNG Ft. Douglas Military Museum Renovation	7,727,000	Federal Funds	
Board of Pardons/UDOC Hearing Room	600,000	Federal Funds	
Public Safety - Orem Facility	2,372,500	Property Trade	\$25,000
	<u>\$88,999,500</u>		<u>\$964,000</u>

#### *Recommended O&M*

As facilities come online they carry an impact for routine operation and maintenance. Legislative policy requires agencies to acknowledge State funded obligations when requesting non-State funded buildings. In the past, the Legislature expressed concern that O&M funds were not considered in acceptance of non-state funded buildings. Agencies also expressed frustration that O&M funds often were not appropriated once facilities were approved. To bridge this gap, committee chairs of the Capital Facilities and Administrative Services subcommittee now communicate with chairs of operational committees that will be affected by future O&M requests. While this is not a guarantee of future funding, it is an attempt to use as much information as possible in accepting buildings.

### **3.5 Court Facilities**

Current leased facilities in Murray can not accommodate future growth for the Salt Lake District Court. Over the past three years growth in Salt Lake County concentrated in Sandy, Riverton, Draper and Bluffdale. Working with Sandy City officials, the Administrative Office of the Courts developed a plan in which the state would purchase 2.88 acres of property next to Sandy City Hall for a court expansion. The Analyst now understands that Sandy City intends to use the property for other needs and does not wish to sell. The Executive Office of the Courts should work with DFCM to develop alternative solutions.

### **3.6 Department of Corrections**

Last year the Department of Corrections (DOC) requested funding for purchase of Salt Lake County's Oxbow Jail. Following extensive debate, the Legislature determined that jail capacity for state needs significantly exceeded inmate counts. The Analyst presented a report on DOC facility needs and provided recommendations for a variety of inmate issues. The report is included behind the "Special Reports" tab or can be located at <http://www.le.state.ut.us/lfa/reports/docfacil.pdf>.

The report found an excess of capacity when totaling empty space within institutional facilities and available space in county jails. In response to Legislative directive, the Department began to restructure operations to focus on rehabilitation rather than punishment. The results have been tremendous: inmate growth is actually declining, crime is down, and the Department mothballed nearly 700 beds. Beyond the millions of dollars saved in operational costs, for the first time in years the Department has no request for new state funded facilities. Utah is a leader in what is becoming a national trend – more and more states are realizing that hard construction and heavy surveillance creates a cost structure that severely hampers the Legislature's ability to prioritize all state needs.

### **3.7 Summary of All Projects**

When considering projects that will be funded with state funds, the Analyst recommendation for facilities totals \$254 million. The recommendation includes projects that are beyond the base budget by approximately \$156 million. These projects, if approved, could be funded with general obligation bonds. The recommendation focuses on the need to take care of existing inventory and addresses approved projects that could not be funded last year due to the revenue shortfall. If non-state funded projects are added, the Analyst recommendation exceeds \$365 million.

*Other Projects*

The Analyst recommendation for capital development focuses on the need to replace aging infrastructure. Although many agencies and colleges have significant needs for new space, it seems that the best use of funds for this year is to take care of the facilities already in the State's inventory. If additional funds are available and the Legislature is committed to funding additional costs associated with new space, the Analyst would prioritize added projects as follows (state funds):

- UVSC Wasatch Campus (\$9,587,000)
- SLCC Health Sciences Building (\$16,687,400)
- Public Safety – West Valley Driver License Facility (\$5,749,300)
- SUU – Teacher Education Building (\$16,581,300)
- WSU – McKay/Dee Property Purchase (\$7,700,000)
- UCAT – Vernal Campus (\$8,283,600)

*UVSC Wasatch Campus*

Utah Valley State College is the fastest growing college in the state. Over the last four years the Capital Facilities Committee approved, and the Legislature funded, new buildings totaling more than \$49 million. Even with the addition of this new space on the Orem campus, the college continues to burst at the seams. Of the many space solutions offered, adding additional campuses seems to be one of the best alternatives to alleviate space problems.

Even though new campuses will likely provide a significant portion of UVSC's long term needs, the Analyst does not believe that a new campus in Wasatch County is the most efficient way to solve the problem. The proposed campus is not near the core of students in Utah county and will require a significant appropriation for faculty, administration and operations. Since the local community demonstrated a significant commitment by offering cash, land and utility connections, it would seem appropriate for the state to make a decision regarding future expansion to Wasatch County. In spite of the generous donations offered, the cost to the state still exceeds \$9.5 million. Therefore, the Analyst recommends that UVSC should seek to purchase an option on the future campus and offers the following intent language to guide the process:

*It is the intent of the Legislature that UVSC shall seek to purchase an option on property located in Wasatch County as presented to the Legislature for future expansion of the College. It is further the intent of the Legislature that no option shall be purchased until UVSC has written commitments for donations of \$5,000,000 in cash, 23 acres of property and full water/sewer connections.*



### *SLCC Health Science Center*

Salt Lake Community College's West Jordan Campus is a prime example of intergovernmental cooperation at its best. The campus houses the newest campus in the Utah System of Higher Education and a vocational education center owned by the Jordan School District. The current SLCC facility at the West Jordan Campus offers general education and state of the art training in dental professions. Focusing on the emerging needs for health care professionals, the College requests approval for a \$16.8 million facility to train workers in medical assisting and to prepare students to pursue four year degrees in health fields. In spite of the fact that SLCC growth and space problems are surpassed only by UVSC, the Analyst is concerned that a new campus may result in additional costs that the state will be hard pressed to fund given current revenue conditions.

### *West Valley Driver's License Facility*

The Department of Public Safety is headquartered in the Calvin Rampton Building in West Valley City, near I-215 and 4700 South. Administrative space is tight, with cubicles set up in maze-like fashion and cramped to a size that is significantly smaller than state space standards. However, administrative space restrictions are not as pronounced as the undersized driver's license facility across the street. The license issuance office was built in 1975 – since then Salt Lake County has grown by seventy-two percent. Waits for customers routinely exceed two hours and the office is packed every day.



The level of service demanded results in daily “cut-offs” for customers that make it difficult for patrons to arrive at 4:30 or later and receive services. While there needs to be a solution to the problem, the Analyst is not convinced that a new facility will solve all issues. New online renewals should provide some relief and the Analyst believes that other technologies could offer better service for patrons. Restaurants and amusement parks employ electronic devices that reserve a window of time for service. The same system could be employed for those seeking new licenses or who have problems that take more than a couple of minutes. Such a system could allow customers to tend to other business and return to the center at a pre-determined time, eliminating the seemingly endless line in the building.



### *SUU Teacher Education Building*

In 1998 the Legislature provided funds to purchase a middle school and sixteen acres of land from Iron County School District. Further analysis from DFCM found that the middle school building posed a significant threat to life safety and was razed this year using capital improvement funds. The University now requests \$16.5 million to build a new classroom building for the Teacher Education program.

SUU maintains a tradition of providing excellent teacher education. One-fourth of the undergraduate student body at SUU is preparing to enter the classroom. With a burgeoning student population and a retiring teacher corps, it is clear that the state must train and retain classroom teachers. An impediment to the SUU project is its score on the Regent's Q&P list, a system that, among other things, measures space allocation against full time enrollment. The Q&P provides a consistent measure of needs, but cannot account for policy goals such as ensuring an adequate supply of teachers. While current space for teacher education programs at SUU is less than optimal, the Analyst is concerned about future costs associated with the addition of 62,000 net square feet of new space at the University. Approval of this project should be accompanied by an affirmation that the state is willing to incur the added costs of a new facility.

### *WSU Property Purchase*

Like all campuses in the USHE, Weber State is constantly on alert for expansion space. Intermountain Health Care plans to demolish all hospital buildings (with the exception of the East Professional Building) and offered to sell 22.5 acres to Weber State along with a 600 stall parking terrace.



Officials at the University believe that this property will provide long term growth space for the campus and alleviate short term parking difficulties. The Analyst is concerned that purchase of this property will encourage expansion of the main campus at a time when the University is seeking to gain a foothold in Davis County, home to nearly one-third of its student body. It seems likely that WSU growth will focus on Davis County and that the additional property will not provide much utility to the main campus. If the Legislature finds this purchase to be critical, the Analyst recommends holding it vacant for as long as possible to maximize growth potential and to retain it as a saleable asset.

*UCAT Vernal Branch Campus*

Last year the Legislature approved \$275,000 for a property purchase by the former Uintah Basin ATC. Now as a part of the Utah College of Applied Technology, the Uintah Basin College of Applied Technology seeks approval of a branch campus in Roosevelt. As with projects requested by USHE schools, the Analyst is concerned about the long term costs associated with creating a new campus. The existing UCAT campus in Roosevelt provides a full complement of courses and offers critical courses in conjunction with the local high school in Vernal, some forty miles away. The local community impact board pledged \$2 million for the project, leaving \$8.2 million for the state to fund for project completion. As with other projects discussed in this section, the Analyst encourages the Legislature to fully consider the long term costs associated with creation of new campuses before approving capital construction.

**FY 2003 Analyst Recommendation – All Projects**

<b>Project</b>	<b>State Funds</b>	<b>Federal Funds</b>	<b>Inst. Funds</b>	<b>G. O. Bond</b>	<b>Total Project</b>	<b>Est. O&amp;M</b>
Capital Improvements	\$49,386,000		\$700,000		\$50,086,000	
Weber State University Classroom Building---Davis Campus				\$20,500,000	20,500,000	558,200
Dixie State College Eccles/Graff Performing Arts Ctr.	13,308,000		3,500,000		16,808,000	281,200
Snow College Performing Arts Center			2,000,000	15,583,000	17,583,000	200,000
Brigham City Education Center Purchase	2,741,000				2,741,000	
U of U Health Sciences Building				37,500,000	37,500,000	676,000
USU Merrill Library				40,200,000	40,200,000	500,000
U of U Marriott Library			17,000,000	37,253,500	54,253,500	500,000
Capitol Preservation Board Capitol Restoration Design	17,970,000				17,970,000	
Youth Corrections St. George	1,792,700	\$5,424,300		1,792,700	9,009,700	272,200
Youth Corrections Canyonlands	3,125,000	2,476,000		3,125,000	8,726,000	167,500
DABC Tooele Package Store Replacement				1,836,300	1,836,300	
Utah National Guard American Fork Armory				(1,600,000)	(525,300)	
SLCC Grand Theater Renovate/Addition	1,074,700		12,000,000		12,000,000	240,000
U of U Department of Chemistry Gauss House			1,500,000		1,500,000	67,700
U of U Eccles Health Science Library			7,500,000		7,500,000	34,700
U of U Moran Eye Ctr. II Addition			16,900,000		16,900,000	
U of U Children's Dance Theatre			6,100,000		6,100,000	
USU Research Foundation Facility			19,000,000		19,000,000	
USU Teaching Pavilion Animal Science Farm			500,000		500,000	30,300
SUU Student Housing Complex			11,000,000		11,000,000	
UNG Salt Lake/Davis Co. Land Acquisition			1,300,000		1,300,000	
Snow South Multipurpose Center			2,500,000		2,500,000	566,300
UNG Ft. Douglas Military Museum Renovation			7,727,000		7,727,000	
Board of Pardons/UDOC Hearing Room		600,000				
Public Safety - Orem Facility						
	\$89,397,400	\$8,500,300	\$111,599,500	\$156,190,500	\$365,087,700	\$4,119,100

**Building Board Ranking**

<b>FY 2003 State Funded Capital Development</b>		
<b>Building Board Ranking 10/15/01</b>		
<b>Agency/Institution</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>State Funding</b>
Capital Improvement Funding	Required by Statute 1.1% Bldg. Value	\$ 49,386,000
Weber State University	Classroom Building---Davis Campus	\$ 20,500,000
Snow College	Performing Arts Center	\$ 15,583,000
Dixie State College	Eccles/Graff Performing Arts Ctr.	\$ 13,308,000
Division of Facilities Construction & Management	Ogden Regional Center---Planning	\$ 100,000
Division of Facilities Construction & Management	Washington Co. Regional Ctr---Planning	\$ 100,000
Utah Schools for Deaf & Blind	Connor St. Replacement---Planning	\$ 40,000
Capitol Preservation Board	Capitol Restoration Design	\$ 17,970,000
U of U & USU	Marriott & Merrill Library Renovation Study	\$ 3,000,000
Courts	Sandy Land Purchase	\$ 967,000
Brigham City Education Center	Purchase	\$ 2,741,000
Utah Valley State College	Wasatch Campus--Heber City	\$ 9,587,000
Southern Utah University	Teacher Education Building	\$ 18,113,000
Department of Public Safety	West Valley Drivers License Facility	\$ 5,749,000
Division of Youth Corrections	Washington County Facility	\$ 7,217,000
Salt Lake Community College	Health Sciences Center	\$ 16,687,000
Division of Youth Corrections	Canyonlands Facility	\$ 5,866,000
Weber State University	IHC/McKay-Dee Property Acquisition	\$ 7,700,000
Division of Parks & Recreation	Goblin Valley State Park	\$ 1,937,000
Courts	Sandy Land Purchase/Design	\$ 1,442,000
UCAT Uintah Basin ATC	Vernal Campus	\$ 7,506,000
Division of Facilities Construction & Management	OMC Building Purchase	To Be Negotiated

## Utah System of Higher Education Priority List

Regent's Capital Budget Priority List		
Rank	Project	State Funds
Restore	UofU Engineering Building	\$2,300,000.00
Restore	WSU Davis Campus Building/Infrastructure	20,500,000
Restore	Snow Performing Arts Building	15,100,000
Restore	Dixie Eccles/Graff Fine and Performing Arts Center	13,000,000
	1 USU Merrill Library Replacement	30,000,000
	2 UVSC Wasatch Campus Building	9,500,000
	3 UofU Marriott Library Renovation	35,600,000
	4 CEU Fine Arts Complex	10,428,000
	5 Snow Classroom Building	5,000,000
	6 UofU Health Sciences Building	37,500,000
	6 SLCC Health Sciences Center	17,000,000
	8 Dixie Health Sciences Building	16,700,000
	9 SUU Teacher Education Building	14,200,000
	10 CEU San Juan Campus Center	4,141,800
	11 Snow South Business and Administration Building	6,990,380
Land	WSU McKay-Dee Hospital Property	7,700,000
		<u>\$245,660,180.00</u>

#### 4.0 Funding History

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>
General Fund	46,061,900	47,310,300	35,505,300	65,099,400	65,099,400
General Fund, One-time			13,400,000	(6,488,000)	
Uniform School Fund	9,059,300	8,134,000	11,816,100		
Income Tax	1,940,700	3,682,100		24,298,000	24,298,000
Income Tax, One-time	10,500,000		82,546,000	(8,628,500)	
Transportation Fund			611,000		
Transportation Fund, One-time	2,118,900			1,399,000	
Federal Funds	3,505,800	3,662,500	1,170,000		8,500,300
Dedicated Credits Revenue	59,868,600	9,028,000	428,000	41,000,000	22,500,000
Dedicated Credits - GO Bonds	48,505,300	54,501,200	8,600,000	18,628,500	156,190,500
Dedicated Credits - Revenue Bonds				10,735,800	
GFR - Special Administrative Expense				1,186,700	
GFR - State Court Complex				700,000	
Olympic Special Revenue				28,500,000	
Transfers	686,300	4,949,000		387,000	
Transfers - Project Reserve Fund					800,000
Transfers - Youth Corrections			2,319,200		
Beginning Nonlapsing			36,500		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$182,246,800</b>	<b>\$131,267,100</b>	<b>\$156,432,100</b>	<b>\$176,817,900</b>	<b>\$277,388,200</b>
<b>Programs</b>					
Capital Improvements	31,893,500	33,558,000	36,753,000	39,594,000	50,086,000
Capital Planning	40,000	50,000	2,086,500	40,000	18,070,000
Capital Development	150,313,300	97,659,100	117,592,600	137,183,900	209,232,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$182,246,800</b>	<b>\$131,267,100</b>	<b>\$156,432,100</b>	<b>\$176,817,900</b>	<b>\$277,388,200</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>					
Other Charges/Pass Thru	182,246,800	131,267,100	156,432,100	176,817,900	277,388,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$182,246,800</b>	<b>\$131,267,100</b>	<b>\$156,432,100</b>	<b>\$176,817,900</b>	<b>\$277,388,200</b>